Hearing Transcript

Project:	Connah's Quay Low Carbon Power Project
Hearing:	Recording of Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3) - Part 2
Date:	17 March 2026

Please note: This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

1
00:00:00.000 --> 00:01:36.300
Okay,

2
00:01:36.360 --> 00:01:38.520
thank you for returning to the room.

3
00:01:38.600 --> 00:01:42.280
Uh, we're now going to, move on to the fifth item on the

4
00:01:42.300 --> 00:01:45.660
agenda, which is, water, environment and flood risk, if that's

5
00:01:45.780 --> 00:01:47.520
okay, please. Um,

6
00:01:48.400 --> 00:01:51.240
so I'm gonna dive into, not figuratively, the water environment and flood risk

7
00:01:51.300 --> 00:01:55.060
issues for the site. Uh, I'll start with the risks presented to the

8
00:01:55.140 --> 00:01:58.950
site by its adjacent location to the River Dee, and then

9
00:01:59.000 --> 00:02:02.560
move on to any of the impacts the proposed development may have on that water body,

10
00:02:02.570 --> 00:02:05.020
if that's okay. That's where I'd like to concentrate.

11
00:02:05.030 --> 00:02:07.960
Again, I'm gonna prompt the applicant to answer some specific questions, but I'm

12
00:02:08.021 --> 00:02:10.100
happy to take feedback from any specialists,

13

00:02:11.520 --> 00:02:14.709
in the room or online and any IPs who wish to highlight any

14
00:02:14.780 --> 00:02:17.260
points to me, or ask through the chair of the

15
00:02:17.300 --> 00:02:20.960
applicant. So item five point one is the

16
00:02:21.020 --> 00:02:23.500
current and future coastal flood risk at the site

17
00:02:24.680 --> 00:02:27.920
of the proposed development and the methodology and range of
considerations that

18
00:02:27.940 --> 00:02:30.520
have been taken into consideration in assessing that risk.

19
00:02:31.500 --> 00:02:35.400
Firstly, thank you again for your response to my written questions.

20
00:02:35.420 --> 00:02:38.500
That was helpful. And what I wanted to really delve into there, I
wanted to

21
00:02:38.520 --> 00:02:42.040
understand from your reply that the flood risk at the site is not

22
00:02:42.120 --> 00:02:45.520
sensitive to the risk of a combined tidal and fluvial

23
00:02:45.560 --> 00:02:48.880
event. But I was particularly interested in the,

24
00:02:49.640 --> 00:02:52.660
like the multivariate, analysis of the flood risk from coastal

25
00:02:52.740 --> 00:02:55.740
sources. So looking at its proximity to the River

26

00:02:55.780 --> 00:02:59.700
Dee and the risk from such events in joint probability,

27
00:02:59.720 --> 00:03:03.380
such as tide and wind or tide and wave or tide, wind and wave and wave

28
00:03:03.480 --> 00:03:07.180
period, and all those combinations that come together of those, that

29
00:03:07.540 --> 00:03:09.300
contribute towards coastal flood risk.

30
00:03:09.880 --> 00:03:13.340
So can you confirm the scenarios that were undertaken for me f-

31
00:03:13.400 --> 00:03:16.680
regarding the coastal flood risk assessment,

32
00:03:17.360 --> 00:03:21.280
and not just purely the, tidal inundation component

33
00:03:21.340 --> 00:03:24.660
of that, if possible, please?

34
00:03:24.740 --> 00:03:26.480
Uh, James Straughn for the applicant.

35
00:03:26.520 --> 00:03:29.800
And so I haven't introduced everyone who, who's helping on this.

36
00:03:29.820 --> 00:03:31.490
Perhaps I'll just do that-

37
00:03:31.500 --> 00:03:31.510
Yes.

38
00:03:31.510 --> 00:03:31.960
-so that you-

39
00:03:31.980 --> 00:03:32.390

Thank you. Sorry.

40
00:03:32.390 --> 00:03:34.540
-know roughly where we're g-going to go.

41
00:03:34.580 --> 00:03:38.240
So Laura McKechnie is just, one, two, three

42
00:03:38.860 --> 00:03:42.640
down from, from me, and, she'll be

43
00:03:42.700 --> 00:03:46.280
dealing with coastal flood risk, your first question if,

44
00:03:46.940 --> 00:03:50.580
in a moment, and she is a flood risk specialist.

45
00:03:50.680 --> 00:03:50.920
Uh,

46
00:03:52.140 --> 00:03:55.520
I've got, Roger Bramwood here dealing with water

47
00:03:55.840 --> 00:03:58.920
abstraction and discharge when we come on to it.

48
00:03:58.960 --> 00:04:02.800
I've got Kathy Owen, four down

49
00:04:02.860 --> 00:04:03.740
from me-

50
00:04:03.750 --> 00:04:03.760
Hi.

51
00:04:03.769 --> 00:04:07.040
-um, who is going to deal with

52
00:04:07.080 --> 00:04:09.940
drainage, broadly speaking.

53
00:04:10.840 --> 00:04:13.720
And online, I hope,

54
00:04:14.780 --> 00:04:18.680
is Guy Walker Springett, who is a

55
00:04:18.700 --> 00:04:22.240
coastal geomorphologist, because you also raised

56
00:04:22.520 --> 00:04:26.380
something to do with physical processes, as it's sometimes known as,

57
00:04:26.440 --> 00:04:29.160
but the coastal, coastal

58
00:04:29.220 --> 00:04:33.160
erosion. I hope that helps. And if- with that, I'll hand

59
00:04:33.260 --> 00:04:36.820
over to Ms. McKechnie.

60
00:04:37.660 --> 00:04:41.160
And then- We have

61
00:04:41.260 --> 00:04:42.340
also online-

62
00:04:43.800 --> 00:04:45.190
Richard Moore.

63
00:04:45.190 --> 00:04:48.270
Richard, Richard Moore, I hope he's online, who may be...

64
00:04:48.300 --> 00:04:51.700
He-- If, if we get into it, on the hydraulic

65
00:04:51.860 --> 00:04:55.500
modeling, particularly for coastal

66
00:04:55.880 --> 00:04:58.080

flood risk, he'll be able to assist you.

67
00:04:58.140 --> 00:05:00.060
So I apologize I, I left him off.

68
00:05:00.100 --> 00:05:00.300
That's okay.

69
00:05:00.320 --> 00:05:01.180
I hope he's there.

70
00:05:01.200 --> 00:05:01.760
Okay.

71
00:05:01.960 --> 00:05:03.010
Thanks.

72
00:05:03.420 --> 00:05:06.260
Would you... So sorry, apologies, I should have asked you to
introduce your, your

73
00:05:06.300 --> 00:05:08.469
panel. No other parties have changed.

74
00:05:08.840 --> 00:05:12.100
Uh, unless there's anyone else you want to introduce, feel free.

75
00:05:12.200 --> 00:05:12.460
Um,

76
00:05:15.000 --> 00:05:18.230
would you like me to go back over the, sort of, the summary of the
question that I

77
00:05:18.280 --> 00:05:19.700
asked, Ms. McKechnie?

78
00:05:19.740 --> 00:05:20.100
Yeah.

79
00:05:20.110 --> 00:05:22.680

Yeah. So I want to-- I was saying I'm, I'm happy that you've, you've explained to

80
00:05:22.720 --> 00:05:26.620
me that there is no, that the risk of joint probability tidal

81
00:05:26.640 --> 00:05:28.700
fluvial is, is, is insignificant.

82
00:05:28.740 --> 00:05:32.300
What I was interested in was the, if, if there was a multivariate coastal flood

83
00:05:32.340 --> 00:05:35.720
risk analysis done looking at the components of,

84
00:05:36.480 --> 00:05:38.250
that, that contribute towards coastal flood risk.

85
00:05:38.320 --> 00:05:41.900
You know, the wave, wind and tide component, and whether it was more

86
00:05:41.920 --> 00:05:44.180
susceptible to one of those variables than

87
00:05:44.220 --> 00:05:46.320
another.

88
00:05:46.400 --> 00:05:48.250
Um, Laura McKechnie on behalf of the applicant.

89
00:05:48.300 --> 00:05:52.040
Um, I'm afraid that one is more hydraulic modeling related, so I think I'm gonna

90
00:05:52.400 --> 00:05:54.840
speak to my colleague, Rich Moore, see if he's online and-

91
00:05:54.880 --> 00:05:55.380
Okay.

92

00:05:55.400 --> 00:05:56.640
-can respond to that one.

93
00:05:56.700 --> 00:05:58.640
Okay.

94
00:06:00.220 --> 00:06:01.840
Sorry, Mr. Moore, do you

95
00:06:02.496 --> 00:06:05.216
Yeah. Hi, Richard Moore on behalf of the applicant.

96
00:06:05.276 --> 00:06:09.026
Um, yep, so theee-- when we did our hydraulic

97
00:06:09.076 --> 00:06:12.956
modeling, like you said, the, the tidal flood risk from the, the D
estuary is

98
00:06:12.996 --> 00:06:14.896
the most predominant source of flood risk.

99
00:06:14.936 --> 00:06:18.856
So we looked at a range of events, so looking at

100
00:06:18.916 --> 00:06:22.676
the zero point five percent AEP event for both

101
00:06:22.716 --> 00:06:25.986
present day, twenty twenty-four, right through various,

102
00:06:26.516 --> 00:06:29.626
climate change scenarios, so looking at twenty

103
00:06:29.736 --> 00:06:32.476
seventy-four and twenty one hundred.

104
00:06:32.486 --> 00:06:36.216
And for each of those tidal scenarios, we

105
00:06:36.296 --> 00:06:39.316

had a, a small fluvial inflow from the River

106
00:06:39.356 --> 00:06:42.716
Dee. Um, we retained this from the existing modeling that was

107
00:06:42.756 --> 00:06:46.396
done by NRW. Um, and like I said, it's just a very small

108
00:06:46.456 --> 00:06:49.726
inflow to allow some sort of assessment there of,

109
00:06:50.616 --> 00:06:53.056
the River Dee coming from, further

110
00:06:53.096 --> 00:06:56.876
upstream. In, in terms of kind of a sensitivity

111
00:06:56.956 --> 00:07:00.036
run, we then looked at some greater fluvial runs.

112
00:07:00.076 --> 00:07:03.256
So we ran a, a thirty-year fluvial event on the River

113
00:07:03.636 --> 00:07:07.496
Dee, combining with a, a tidal event

114
00:07:07.616 --> 00:07:10.096
just to understand the impact to the site.

115
00:07:10.156 --> 00:07:13.656
And yeah, that was all documented within our, in our report.

116
00:07:13.716 --> 00:07:17.376
In terms of, when we built the model, we did

117
00:07:17.616 --> 00:07:21.576
produce some new tidal boundaries which took into account

118
00:07:21.796 --> 00:07:25.496
surge, and obviously extreme water level.

119
00:07:25.556 --> 00:07:28.736
We didn't look into wave overtopping.

120
00:07:28.756 --> 00:07:32.076
We discussed this with NRW, and it was confirmed that this wasn't, a

121
00:07:32.086 --> 00:07:35.876
requirement, mainly because the risk from still water level

122
00:07:35.956 --> 00:07:39.516
was the, the main source of risk to the site.

123
00:07:41.356 --> 00:07:41.946
Okay. Thank you, Mr.

124
00:07:41.946 --> 00:07:45.776
Moore.

125
00:07:48.296 --> 00:07:52.276
So okay, again, what we're looking at in, in-- to be blunt, in

126
00:07:52.316 --> 00:07:55.646
the flood risk assessment is a still water inundation risk
assessment, so it's

127
00:07:55.646 --> 00:07:59.076
taking into account tidal levels, tidal potentially

128
00:07:59.116 --> 00:08:02.256
with limited elements of fluvial, like you say, which don't seem to
be too

129
00:08:02.676 --> 00:08:06.436
significant to worry about, and surge modeling, which is basically
an addition

130
00:08:06.536 --> 00:08:07.096
residual

131
00:08:08.456 --> 00:08:12.156
to the tide level. I, I... yeah, I'm surprised on an open

132
00:08:12.236 --> 00:08:16.096
coast environment for a piece of critical national infrastructu-
infrastructure even

133
00:08:16.716 --> 00:08:16.916
that

134
00:08:17.876 --> 00:08:20.506
a multivariate coastal approach has not been

135
00:08:20.576 --> 00:08:23.196
taken. Um,

136
00:08:27.356 --> 00:08:29.476
what would the freeboard be

137
00:08:30.576 --> 00:08:34.336
for your defense height on those, coastal scenarios then?

138
00:08:34.356 --> 00:08:38.156
Because it, it, you know, the slightest, even-- I'm just

139
00:08:38.196 --> 00:08:41.496
thinking of the, the, the fetch across from the width of the estuary

140
00:08:42.156 --> 00:08:43.797
is clearly,

141
00:08:45.116 --> 00:08:46.596
wind wave action from

142
00:08:48.416 --> 00:08:52.256
the other side of the estuary to this side, let alone any activity
from waves

143
00:08:52.336 --> 00:08:55.276
in the Irish Sea propagating into the River Dee.

144
00:08:55.316 --> 00:08:59.236
What would be the l-level of freeboard perhaps for your defense

height that,

145
00:08:59.256 --> 00:09:03.036
you know, what level of protection is afforded to the site, that you don't

146
00:09:03.076 --> 00:09:04.416
get wet next to the

147
00:09:04.425 --> 00:09:08.556
defenses?

148
00:09:10.316 --> 00:09:12.116
Laura McKechnie on behalf of the applicant.

149
00:09:12.176 --> 00:09:16.056
Um, so the site was modeled without any defenses, with all the

150
00:09:16.096 --> 00:09:19.836
defenses removed, along the main development area.

151
00:09:19.916 --> 00:09:23.536
Yeah. No, I appreciate, yeah, you've done an undefended scenario, but obviously it

152
00:09:23.546 --> 00:09:27.396
is, it is defended, isn't it? And my concern would be that if you get overtopping

153
00:09:27.456 --> 00:09:31.336
of wave action into the site, it can't get back into the

154
00:09:31.356 --> 00:09:35.016
river, so you end up filling up the basin, if you

155
00:09:35.056 --> 00:09:38.836
like.

156
00:09:40.476 --> 00:09:42.556
Uh, Laura McKechnie on behalf of the applicant.

157

00:09:42.616 --> 00:09:45.396
Um, I think that's one we'll need to take away with us and have a
look at.

158
00:09:45.416 --> 00:09:47.286
Okay, thank you. Um,

159
00:09:49.436 --> 00:09:53.276
just quickly, again, I wouldn't want to not give you the opportunity
to

160
00:09:53.376 --> 00:09:56.656
speak, but would NRW, would you like to comment on, I don't know if
you have

161
00:09:56.696 --> 00:09:59.496
your flood risk specialist with you or if you wanted to comment on,
the

162
00:09:59.576 --> 00:10:01.056
comments that have just been made by the applicant.

163
00:10:01.096 --> 00:10:04.036
Equally, I'm happy for you to, come back in writing if you

164
00:10:04.096 --> 00:10:06.576
prefer.

165
00:10:08.256 --> 00:10:09.916
Thank you, sir. Chris Jones for NRW.

166
00:10:09.996 --> 00:10:13.516
Uh, yeah, we don't currently have any comments to make at the
moment, on what's

167
00:10:13.576 --> 00:10:15.486
been, just discussed now by the applicant.

168
00:10:15.496 --> 00:10:18.895
However, we can come back in writing, with any further, further
advice in due

169

00:10:18.936 --> 00:10:20.496
course.

170
00:10:20.516 --> 00:10:22.215
Okay, thank you. Um,

171
00:10:23.976 --> 00:10:26.096
I'm going to move on slightly now to

172
00:10:33.676 --> 00:10:35.436
the issue of the hydraulic model, if that's okay.

173
00:10:35.456 --> 00:10:37.256
So perhaps I'll come back again to Mr.

174
00:10:37.296 --> 00:10:41.216
Moore, if that's okay, and also coming back again to NRW possibly b-
on

175
00:10:41.256 --> 00:10:45.116
this. Looking at the still water inundation model that you

176
00:10:45.156 --> 00:10:47.256
have created,

177
00:10:48.156 --> 00:10:51.556
it shows different results to the flood zone

178
00:10:51.956 --> 00:10:54.636
pre-risk mapping that's been produced by

179
00:10:55.396 --> 00:10:59.356
N-NRW. I understand that the approach that the

180
00:10:59.396 --> 00:11:03.056
applicant's taken is more detailed, and it's not a high-level
assessment

181
00:11:03.396 --> 00:11:05.956
like the national flood risk assessment.

182

00:11:06.076 --> 00:11:10.066
I wondered if NRW have a comment on

183
00:11:12.116 --> 00:11:14.816
effectively the applicant is showing that they

184
00:11:14.856 --> 00:11:18.636
believe a flood zone three for the site is

185
00:11:18.656 --> 00:11:21.516
different to what NRW is saying. Is there

186
00:11:21.756 --> 00:11:25.336
an, is there a possibility that NRW are gonna

187
00:11:25.376 --> 00:11:28.516
refine their position and say, "Okay, we take on board that you've done a more

188
00:11:28.556 --> 00:11:32.156
rigorous and detailed analysis, therefore we're gonna change our flood risk map"?

189
00:11:32.196 --> 00:11:35.476
Or are we gonna have this sense of confusion existing

190
00:11:36.296 --> 00:11:40.156
that you say the site's not at flood risk, whereas the national risk

191
00:11:40.196 --> 00:11:43.516
assessment says it is? So if I start with the applicant with that first,

192
00:11:43.536 --> 00:11:45.696
please.

193
00:11:45.756 --> 00:11:47.746
Yeah. Laura McKechnie on behalf of the applicant.

194
00:11:47.816 --> 00:11:51.636
Um, so the flood zone three flood map-- The

195
00:11:51.696 --> 00:11:55.326
flood map for planning shows the site to be in flood zone three, but that's,

196
00:11:55.876 --> 00:11:59.276
an undefended scenario and includes climate change.

197
00:11:59.336 --> 00:12:03.036
Um, if you look at the flood clast-- coast and erosion map, risk map,

198
00:12:03.046 --> 00:12:06.536
that shows the site itself, the main development area,

199
00:12:07.296 --> 00:12:10.336
isn't in flood zone-- within the flood zone because of, the tidal

200
00:12:10.456 --> 00:12:12.432
fence defensesUm,

201
00:12:13.452 --> 00:12:17.352
our model is more site-specific. So the model which we got--

202
00:12:17.372 --> 00:12:21.312
received from NRW didn't extend as far as our site.

203
00:12:21.372 --> 00:12:21.892
Yes.

204
00:12:21.952 --> 00:12:25.532
So it doesn't cover-- quite cover the site area, which is why we've

205
00:12:25.572 --> 00:12:28.712
extended it further downstream to cover the site, so therefore it's more

206
00:12:28.752 --> 00:12:32.192
site-specific. Thanks.

207
00:12:38.732 --> 00:12:41.952
But again, you know, firstly, it, it doesn't include all of the

active

208
00:12:42.712 --> 00:12:44.852
m-m-meteorological activities that could happen in the estuary.

209
00:12:44.912 --> 00:12:48.892
So it's, it's purely a tide, a high tide, albeit an extreme water

210
00:12:48.932 --> 00:12:52.502
level, but a high tide based on your annual exceedance probabilities
that you were

211
00:12:52.502 --> 00:12:53.892
citing.

212
00:12:55.472 --> 00:12:56.892
And then secondly,

213
00:12:58.132 --> 00:13:01.992
you've modeled for an undefended scenario, but I'm curious about a

214
00:13:02.012 --> 00:13:05.802
breach scenario of defenses because historically in,

215
00:13:05.812 --> 00:13:09.261
particularly in power stations and, you know, places like Hinkley
Point and other

216
00:13:09.272 --> 00:13:09.972
ones like this,

217
00:13:10.772 --> 00:13:14.092
where a site is defended and the breach-- and defenses have been
breached, flooding

218
00:13:14.152 --> 00:13:18.092
can be worse because water can get through the breach and can't get
back

219
00:13:18.172 --> 00:13:21.312
out again. So you end up with a very different,

220
00:13:22.452 --> 00:13:26.272
flood map than that, that which is modeled in an undefended
scenario.

221
00:13:26.292 --> 00:13:29.092
Sometimes undefended allows the water to drain back into the river.

222
00:13:30.032 --> 00:13:33.312
So I'm curious about the sensitivity of that and whether actually a
defended

223
00:13:33.392 --> 00:13:37.152
scenario c- albeit with a breach or wave overtopping, could

224
00:13:37.212 --> 00:13:39.952
actually result in a worse flood risk scenario for

225
00:13:40.032 --> 00:13:41.292
you.

226
00:13:42.172 --> 00:13:44.232
Um, Laura McKechnie on behalf of the applicant.

227
00:13:44.272 --> 00:13:47.862
So the undefended scenario wa-was a partially defended

228
00:13:47.932 --> 00:13:51.832
scenario, was agreed with NRW that that was the worst case scenario,

229
00:13:51.872 --> 00:13:55.032
and that was, the one which should be used rather than a breach

230
00:13:55.052 --> 00:13:58.972
scenario. Um, the defenses at the site are

231
00:13:59.652 --> 00:14:02.832
raised ground and a partially set back, gabion

232
00:14:02.892 --> 00:14:06.252
wall with, um... So it's not complete the whole way along.

233
00:14:06.292 --> 00:14:10.012
There's areas in it where water could flow through and then could
escape

234
00:14:10.072 --> 00:14:10.992
again. So it's not

235
00:14:11.692 --> 00:14:15.332
quite...

236
00:14:15.352 --> 00:14:18.212
Okay. Pervious defense.

237
00:14:18.292 --> 00:14:21.531
Um, there's gaps in the defenses.

238
00:14:21.552 --> 00:14:22.012
Hmm.

239
00:14:24.732 --> 00:14:26.452
Defending against a still water tide

240
00:14:26.512 --> 00:14:30.552
level.

241
00:14:32.652 --> 00:14:33.452
So, um—

242
00:14:33.632 --> 00:14:36.432
I'm just saying you've got, you've got effectively a line of
defenses with holes in

243
00:14:36.472 --> 00:14:40.292
them, and what you're telling me is that is defending against the

244
00:14:40.352 --> 00:14:42.412
tide.

245
00:14:42.472 --> 00:14:45.572
Well, what we've modeled is the undefended scenario.

246
00:14:45.632 --> 00:14:46.372
Yeah.

247
00:14:47.632 --> 00:14:50.092
Okay.

248
00:14:56.892 --> 00:14:58.912
Sorry. Roger Brandwood for the applicants.

249
00:14:58.992 --> 00:14:59.232
Um,

250
00:15:01.332 --> 00:15:05.032
regarding those, those existing sort of structures which we're referring to as

251
00:15:05.072 --> 00:15:09.052
defenses, their primary purpose is, is, is not as

252
00:15:09.112 --> 00:15:11.592
a flood defense, it's as a visual screen.

253
00:15:11.652 --> 00:15:15.002
So, so that is-- that's primarily why they are

254
00:15:15.032 --> 00:15:18.972
there. So and then, and as has been noted, there are kind of-

255
00:15:18.992 --> 00:15:19.072
Yeah

256
00:15:19.112 --> 00:15:22.712
...gaps, for want of a better phrase, in them because, you know, their primary

257
00:15:22.752 --> 00:15:24.112
purpose is not as a flood defense.

258
00:15:24.172 --> 00:15:24.712
Understood.

259
00:15:24.792 --> 00:15:25.112
Thank you.

260
00:15:25.122 --> 00:15:28.192
And that's why you've taken out the model to run the undefended
scenario. Okay.

261
00:15:28.232 --> 00:15:28.392
Thank

262
00:15:28.452 --> 00:15:33.552
you.

263
00:15:33.672 --> 00:15:34.052
Um,

264
00:15:35.432 --> 00:15:39.272
okay. Thank

265
00:15:39.312 --> 00:15:41.792
you. Uh, I'll leave that there, I think. I think thank you very
much.

266
00:15:41.852 --> 00:15:45.352
Unless there's anyone who wants to comment in the room or online.

267
00:15:45.932 --> 00:15:49.612
Um, I just want to move on to the range of scenarios that you
discussed and agreed

268
00:15:49.652 --> 00:15:53.052
with NRW. One of the things that jumped out at me is that this

269
00:15:53.352 --> 00:15:55.482
is, the proposal is for a piece of,

270
00:15:57.372 --> 00:15:59.292
bear with me, Critical National Infrastructure,

271
00:15:59.332 --> 00:16:03.182
CNI. I appreciate the CNP component as well, the Critical National

272
00:16:03.192 --> 00:16:06.972
Priority, but the critical national infrastructure in the allowances
for climate

273
00:16:07.032 --> 00:16:10.772
change, I'm slightly surprised to see that you, you-- whilst you've

274
00:16:10.912 --> 00:16:14.672
used a full range of, annual exceedance probabilities for the

275
00:16:14.712 --> 00:16:18.692
still water level, you haven't tended to use the ones that are

276
00:16:18.712 --> 00:16:22.432
recommended for critical national infrastructure, and I was
wondering why

277
00:16:22.672 --> 00:16:25.972
that might be the case. I appreciate the life of the development is,
is perhaps

278
00:16:26.052 --> 00:16:29.312
slightly shorter, but I think

279
00:16:30.152 --> 00:16:34.112
for a piece of infrastructure that's critical to security of the

280
00:16:34.332 --> 00:16:38.292
nation's power supply, w—would just be interesting why that you
haven't used

281
00:16:38.312 --> 00:16:41.192
the recommended values for that.

282
00:16:41.252 --> 00:16:43.412
Um, Laura McKechnie on behalf of the applicant.

283
00:16:43.472 --> 00:16:47.392
So, the design flood event which we looked at was the nought

284

00:16:47.472 --> 00:16:51.202
point five percent AEP twenty seventy-four, the seventieth
percentile

285
00:16:51.292 --> 00:16:54.622
climate change, which showed no flooding within the

286
00:16:54.732 --> 00:16:57.532
site. Um, we looked at additional future resilience

287
00:16:57.552 --> 00:17:01.372
scenarios, and these were to test and to assess the resilience to

288
00:17:01.432 --> 00:17:05.192
future sea level rise and any uncertainty in tide level estimates

289
00:17:05.672 --> 00:17:07.812
and to assess a longer design life.

290
00:17:07.822 --> 00:17:11.692
And the ones we assessed were the nought point five percent AEP
twenty seventy-four

291
00:17:11.712 --> 00:17:15.613
plus the ninety-fifth percentile, the nought point one percent AEP

292
00:17:15.692 --> 00:17:19.672
twenty seventy-four plus the ninety-fifth percentile, the nought
point five percent

293
00:17:19.792 --> 00:17:23.772
AEP twenty one hundred plus the seventieth percentile, and the
nought point one

294
00:17:23.833 --> 00:17:27.292
percent AEP twenty one hundred plus the seventieth percentile.

295
00:17:27.392 --> 00:17:30.682
Um, the results showed that in the nought point five percent AEP
twenty

296
00:17:30.752 --> 00:17:34.552

seventy-four and, the ninety-fifth percentile and the nought point

297
00:17:34.652 --> 00:17:38.372
five percent AEP twenty one hundred and seventieth percentile, there was no

298
00:17:38.412 --> 00:17:41.182
inundation of the proposed permanent development or the operational

299
00:17:41.252 --> 00:17:44.832
footprint. Um, in the nought point one percent AEP twenty

300
00:17:44.892 --> 00:17:48.312
seventy-four plus ninety-fifth percentile, there was inundation up to nought point

301
00:17:48.392 --> 00:17:51.892
one five, meters, but that was only very much in the northeast corner of the

302
00:17:51.932 --> 00:17:55.852
operational footprint. Um, and the worst case one there was the nought point one

303
00:17:55.932 --> 00:17:59.692
percent AEP twenty one hundred plus seventieth percentile, which showed

304
00:17:59.732 --> 00:18:01.612
inundation up to nought point three meters

305
00:18:02.432 --> 00:18:03.872
in the main development area.

306
00:18:04.992 --> 00:18:05.152
Um,

307
00:18:06.092 --> 00:18:06.272
so

308
00:18:07.512 --> 00:18:11.312
both these are extreme events and indicate resilience to future sea

309
00:18:11.352 --> 00:18:14.272
level rise. Um, we provide mitigation for additional

310
00:18:14.332 --> 00:18:18.272
resilience. So the design life is only thirty years

311
00:18:18.312 --> 00:18:22.276
long.Um, so in that scenario where there was flooding,

312
00:18:22.296 --> 00:18:25.996
the nought point one percent AEP twenty-one hundred plus the
seventieth

313
00:18:26.496 --> 00:18:29.596
centile scenario, the scheme would actually no longer be present.

314
00:18:29.656 --> 00:18:33.356
Um, as the site remained largely unaffected in these events, these
extreme

315
00:18:33.416 --> 00:18:37.396
scenarios, the modeling-ling was considered sufficiently
precautionary without the

316
00:18:37.436 --> 00:18:40.796
need in model eight-eight, which, if you look at the flood
consequences

317
00:18:40.836 --> 00:18:44.716
assessments climate change guidance twenty twenty-one, it suggests
it's more often

318
00:18:44.776 --> 00:18:48.256
used for infrastructure with a longer design life beyond the end of
the century

319
00:18:48.756 --> 00:18:51.816
and/or an area which is percent- particularly sensitive to

320
00:18:51.855 --> 00:18:54.796
flooding.

321
00:18:54.836 --> 00:18:55.066
Thank you.

322
00:18:55.096 --> 00:18:56.626
And all that was agreed with NRW.

323
00:18:57.516 --> 00:18:57.916
Okay.

324
00:18:57.936 --> 00:18:58.856
Thanks.

325
00:19:07.656 --> 00:19:11.036
Thank you. I, I appreciate, and I, I have gone through your
assessment and, and y-

326
00:19:11.096 --> 00:19:14.626
I understand the range of, scenarios you've modeled. I just was...

327
00:19:14.636 --> 00:19:17.876
It, it surprised me slightly, as you just alluded to, that, you
know,

328
00:19:18.716 --> 00:19:22.596
the, the recommended scenario for critical national infrastructure,
in

329
00:19:22.656 --> 00:19:26.256
particular power stations on the coast, the H++

330
00:19:26.296 --> 00:19:28.456
scenario has not been considered.

331
00:19:28.496 --> 00:19:32.316
The H++ scenario is quite exceptional, and, you

332
00:19:32.336 --> 00:19:35.216
know, it has been designed for things like nuclear power stations
with a one in ten

333

00:19:35.296 --> 00:19:38.786
thousand, you know, nought point zero zero one AEP, you

334
00:19:38.796 --> 00:19:42.466
know, r-r-return periods and what have you. But I just...

335
00:19:42.466 --> 00:19:46.116
I'm surprised that we have a critical piece of infrastructure that
hasn't

336
00:19:46.216 --> 00:19:50.206
had that scenario tested. I understand you saying, you know, and I,
I

337
00:19:50.236 --> 00:19:53.796
was trying to allude to was, is it because of its shorter life?

338
00:19:53.816 --> 00:19:57.416
But I do imagine there will be some form of power production at this
site

339
00:19:57.836 --> 00:20:01.516
past the life of the development, or be, perhaps repowered under
another

340
00:20:01.556 --> 00:20:04.336
DCO or something else. Um,

341
00:20:05.256 --> 00:20:08.736
yeah, I'm just picking up on that fact that there's a couple of
flags

342
00:20:09.016 --> 00:20:12.976
warning me there that, one, it's only considered still water,

343
00:20:13.036 --> 00:20:15.456
no wind, no waves, no wave period,

344
00:20:16.316 --> 00:20:20.236
no potential for erosion of made ground or the defenses,

345
00:20:20.256 --> 00:20:23.356

excepting that, you know, you've taken an under-defended scenario.

346
00:20:23.396 --> 00:20:25.236
So that's one risk that I'm seeing.

347
00:20:25.336 --> 00:20:29.256
Second risk is that you've r- used a range of AEPs and climate
change

348
00:20:29.336 --> 00:20:33.316
projections, which I understand, but doesn't match the

349
00:20:33.356 --> 00:20:36.316
government-recommended parameters for critical national
infrastructure on the

350
00:20:36.376 --> 00:20:40.176
coast. And so the, y- you know, the two together make me

351
00:20:40.216 --> 00:20:43.296
think, how accurate is the flood risk assessment?

352
00:20:43.316 --> 00:20:45.256
And I think that's, that's where I'm, I'm going with that.

353
00:20:45.276 --> 00:20:48.046
And I've just-- I think, I think you've answered that, and I think
you've said, you

354
00:20:48.056 --> 00:20:51.476
know, there's a shorter duration period for the lifetime of the
development.

355
00:20:51.486 --> 00:20:55.396
There, you've, you've worked with NRW and their experts and agreed
these scenarios

356
00:20:55.576 --> 00:20:58.456
going forward. But I think that's just sitting in the back of my
mind.

357
00:20:58.476 --> 00:21:01.716

But thank you. Thank you for that.

358
00:21:01.976 --> 00:21:06.776
Um,

359
00:21:06.856 --> 00:21:11.796
does,

360
00:21:12.456 --> 00:21:13.845
does anybody want to come in on that?

361
00:21:13.856 --> 00:21:16.356
I'm just conscious, you know, NRW have been mentioned a few times.

362
00:21:16.376 --> 00:21:19.976
I appreciate that you've, you've written a reply on my, question,

363
00:21:20.016 --> 00:21:22.106
examining authority questions, but I want to...

364
00:21:22.136 --> 00:21:24.236
Feel free if you wish to, to comment on that.

365
00:21:24.296 --> 00:21:25.896
Equally, if you don't, I appreciate you don't.

366
00:21:25.916 --> 00:21:29.836
If you don't want to come in right now on that, then follow up in
writing.

367
00:21:29.876 --> 00:21:32.036
So just to check, Mr. Jones, are you happy?

368
00:21:32.056 --> 00:21:34.496
Uh, is there anything you wanted to add to that?

369
00:21:35.776 --> 00:21:39.396
Thank you, sir. Chris Jones, NRW. I don't have anything to add to
that right now.

370
00:21:39.416 --> 00:21:42.156

We don't have a flood risk advisor presence at the, hearing, sorry.

371
00:21:42.216 --> 00:21:42.586
Um, however-

372
00:21:42.716 --> 00:21:42.785
Yeah.

373
00:21:42.796 --> 00:21:45.616
Any specific questions you have for us, I'm happy to come back to
you in writing on

374
00:21:45.636 --> 00:21:46.686
those, at a later time.

375
00:21:46.686 --> 00:21:48.616
That's fine. Thank you. Thank you for that.

376
00:21:48.696 --> 00:21:49.556
Um,

377
00:21:56.556 --> 00:22:00.476
fin-final point on the, on the flood risk assessment at the site is
obviously by,

378
00:22:02.196 --> 00:22:04.696
the proposals that you're doing of your proposed development, one of
the other

379
00:22:04.716 --> 00:22:08.076
things is to make sure you don't make flood risk worse elsewhere.

380
00:22:08.156 --> 00:22:11.906
Uh, and I've, I've just... Af- after reading the consequences report
and looking at

381
00:22:11.936 --> 00:22:15.595
the flood risk assessment, I c- I can't pick out where you've made
that

382
00:22:15.656 --> 00:22:17.216
assessment that

383
00:22:18.256 --> 00:22:21.416
what we're doing is not making it, flood risk worse for other
people.

384
00:22:21.486 --> 00:22:24.876
I just wanted to see if you could perhaps point me to that, if you
could, please.

385
00:22:24.936 --> 00:22:27.396
Certainly, yeah. Lauren McKechnie on behalf of the applicant.

386
00:22:27.476 --> 00:22:31.196
Um, so a proposed scenario was simulated to assess the on and

387
00:22:31.236 --> 00:22:34.596
off-site impacts of land raising within the operational footprint.

388
00:22:34.636 --> 00:22:38.576
So it was... This was simulated for the most extreme event, so the
one which we

389
00:22:38.596 --> 00:22:41.236
were talking about just a minute ago, the nought point one percent
AEP twenty-one

390
00:22:41.315 --> 00:22:44.176
hundred seventy- seventieth centile.

391
00:22:44.256 --> 00:22:44.436
Um,

392
00:22:45.596 --> 00:22:48.446
as this was the only scenario which showed flooding within the
operational

393
00:22:48.496 --> 00:22:51.916
footprint. So when that land raising

394
00:22:52.976 --> 00:22:55.976
was, done, all the flooding was shown to be removed from the
operational

395
00:22:56.036 --> 00:22:59.776
footprint. Um, there were small impacts off-site, which were

396
00:22:59.816 --> 00:23:03.656
centered around Wet Tree Brook, and it was up to, plus nought point

397
00:23:03.756 --> 00:23:06.836
nought five meters tolerance, which was likely as a result of model

398
00:23:06.896 --> 00:23:10.876
instability. Um, there's a culvert there, so we reckon it's
connected to that.

399
00:23:10.896 --> 00:23:12.776
Okay. Thank

400
00:23:12.796 --> 00:23:19.096
you.

401
00:23:21.576 --> 00:23:24.116
But again, just to clarify from my point of view, what we're saying
is your land

402
00:23:24.156 --> 00:23:27.996
raising is not increasing the flood risk for any

403
00:23:28.016 --> 00:23:31.816
other community in and around the Connah's Quay Power Station
development, the

404
00:23:31.856 --> 00:23:33.016
current power project development.

405
00:23:35.016 --> 00:23:38.426
It may, albeit within the stability of the model and the, and the
accuracy of the

406
00:23:38.456 --> 00:23:41.996
model, increase depths of water within some of the water

407

00:23:42.056 --> 00:23:45.676
courses, but it doesn't look like there is a, a residual impact on

408
00:23:46.276 --> 00:23:48.916
other people's risk.

409
00:23:48.976 --> 00:23:51.576
Lauren McKechnie on behalf of the applicant. Yeah, that's correct.

410
00:23:51.616 --> 00:23:54.316
Thank you.

411
00:23:55.976 --> 00:23:59.556
Okay, just gonna, um... Is there any other questions on that topic, on flood

412
00:23:59.636 --> 00:24:03.376
risk, coastal flood risk specifically?

413
00:24:04.176 --> 00:24:07.416
Thank you. Thank you. I'm gonna move on to item five point two, if that's okay

414
00:24:07.456 --> 00:24:11.176
then, which is looking at the erosion risk at the site, and looking at the

415
00:24:11.276 --> 00:24:14.456
methodology and similar sort of approach there, looking at how that's been

416
00:24:14.496 --> 00:24:16.116
addressed. Um,

417
00:24:17.556 --> 00:24:21.066
I'm interested with regards to coastal erosion risk at the site and how that may

418
00:24:21.276 --> 00:24:24.996
change in the fut- futureUm, so

419
00:24:25.256 --> 00:24:27.956

firstly, if I could come to the applicant and say could you please just clarify the

420
00:24:27.996 --> 00:24:31.976
risk the site currently faces? Any site-specific

421
00:24:32.036 --> 00:24:35.546
assessment and sensitivity u- tests that you've done within your physical processes

422
00:24:35.616 --> 00:24:39.096
model or geomorphology model, to address

423
00:24:39.156 --> 00:24:43.086
that, especially given the infilled nature and land-raising nature of

424
00:24:43.096 --> 00:24:46.946
the site. And then I'll move on to a, a, a follow-up question, if

425
00:24:46.956 --> 00:24:49.696
that's okay, please.

426
00:24:51.596 --> 00:24:55.076
James Strong for the applicant. So I think I'm going to hope that Mr.

427
00:24:55.096 --> 00:24:58.456
Walker Springett has made it online, and that he'll be able to help you with

428
00:24:58.496 --> 00:25:02.436
that. Uh, that incidentally, assuming he pops

429
00:25:02.456 --> 00:25:04.436
up, um.

430
00:25:05.636 --> 00:25:06.216
Is he there?

431
00:25:08.296 --> 00:25:08.876
He is there apparently.

432
00:25:08.896 --> 00:25:10.196
Hello. Yes, I'm here.

433
00:25:10.236 --> 00:25:13.516
Okay. And incidentally, one of the documents

434
00:25:14.196 --> 00:25:17.756
that we-- he was intending to provide

435
00:25:18.016 --> 00:25:20.736
falls into that earlier category of, um—

436
00:25:20.746 --> 00:25:20.746
Okay. Apologies

437
00:25:20.746 --> 00:25:22.965
...that we obtained. So maybe if, if...

438
00:25:23.656 --> 00:25:25.736
He'll be able to explain it anyway.

439
00:25:25.776 --> 00:25:25.866
Okay.

440
00:25:25.976 --> 00:25:29.896
But we may follow up in due course with that information in the way
you suggested.

441
00:25:29.916 --> 00:25:32.256
Thank you.

442
00:25:33.976 --> 00:25:36.036
Okay, if I can, move to you. Sorry, Mr.

443
00:25:36.056 --> 00:25:39.756
Walker Springett, I can't see you on my camera here. Sorry,
apologies.

444
00:25:39.796 --> 00:25:41.856
No, no problem. I'm here.

445
00:25:42.076 --> 00:25:45.436
Okay. There you are. Thank you.

446
00:25:47.296 --> 00:25:47.456
Good afternoon.

447
00:25:47.476 --> 00:25:49.096
Yes, so if I could just, yeah, come back.

448
00:25:49.136 --> 00:25:53.016
Yeah, if you could perhaps just clarify briefly the, the risk the
site currently

449
00:25:53.056 --> 00:25:56.916
faces, any site-specific assessment and sensitivity test you've

450
00:25:56.996 --> 00:26:00.536
done for the site, and then I'm particularly interested in

451
00:26:00.616 --> 00:26:04.396
the, risk the site faces because of its infilled nature and

452
00:26:04.456 --> 00:26:05.596
land-raising nature.

453
00:26:06.516 --> 00:26:10.436
Okay. Yeah, absolutely. Uh, Guy Walker Springett on behalf of the
applicant.

454
00:26:10.536 --> 00:26:13.896
Um, we have, run a,

455
00:26:14.336 --> 00:26:18.136
quick spatial, data, assessment of,

456
00:26:18.516 --> 00:26:21.936
the coastal shoreline, around the, the

457
00:26:22.016 --> 00:26:25.956
proposed development site. Um, and this, covers a, a,

458
00:26:27.216 --> 00:26:30.016
a timescale going back to nineteen forty-five, so that's pre

459
00:26:30.556 --> 00:26:32.696
the original development of the site.

460
00:26:32.895 --> 00:26:36.676
Um, and we've tracked the development, of

461
00:26:36.756 --> 00:26:40.516
the saltmarsh edge position, running up to the, the

462
00:26:40.576 --> 00:26:44.116
Dee, main channel. Um, and what we've,

463
00:26:44.736 --> 00:26:48.336
found is that, the,

464
00:26:48.676 --> 00:26:50.556
shoreline position has,

465
00:26:52.216 --> 00:26:56.156
aligned itself, in the last, twenty-three

466
00:26:56.256 --> 00:27:00.236
years, so that, you've had

467
00:27:00.396 --> 00:27:04.316
a, a portion of, a, of shoreline erosion to

468
00:27:04.416 --> 00:27:08.176
the, down-estuary side of the site,

469
00:27:08.616 --> 00:27:11.796
and a progressive, accretion of the

470
00:27:11.836 --> 00:27:15.616
saltmarsh edge, in the up-estuary side,

471

00:27:15.996 --> 00:27:18.356
of the site. So we're seeing a,

472
00:27:19.716 --> 00:27:23.196
a two-sided, feature

473
00:27:23.276 --> 00:27:26.965
here, with the, the, development of this

474
00:27:27.016 --> 00:27:30.876
site, since the, the original, power station was,

475
00:27:30.936 --> 00:27:34.305
was, built here. Um,

476
00:27:35.576 --> 00:27:38.836
and the... there is a figure relating to this and, and this can be

477
00:27:38.876 --> 00:27:42.576
provided, with the, written or oral, submissions

478
00:27:42.636 --> 00:27:46.276
later on, if required, and that outlines

479
00:27:46.456 --> 00:27:49.276
this, this change. Um,

480
00:27:50.076 --> 00:27:53.896
essentially, the, shoreline,

481
00:27:54.156 --> 00:27:57.066
at present appears to be in a, almost

482
00:27:57.176 --> 00:28:01.096
semi-equilibrium state, or certainly has been since two thousand and
eighteen,

483
00:28:01.136 --> 00:28:04.676
with very little fluctuation, in that,

484
00:28:05.016 --> 00:28:08.726

that shoreline. Um, and as such, it's, it's actually quite a stable,

485
00:28:09.016 --> 00:28:12.736
system at present. Um, so, it's changed a

486
00:28:12.816 --> 00:28:16.776
lot in the, early sort of twentieth century, and then in

487
00:28:16.836 --> 00:28:20.796
our, present time period, it has stabilized and the

488
00:28:20.836 --> 00:28:22.686
shoreline is maintaining

489
00:28:22.716 --> 00:28:25.116
itself.

490
00:28:28.856 --> 00:28:30.326
Okay, thank you for that. Um,

491
00:28:34.676 --> 00:28:38.156
because the existing site has been raised and infilled

492
00:28:38.176 --> 00:28:38.676
historically-

493
00:28:38.716 --> 00:28:38.786
Mm-hmm

494
00:28:38.786 --> 00:28:41.416
...and there's a proposal to infill and raise again-

495
00:28:41.756 --> 00:28:41.916
Mm-hmm

496
00:28:41.996 --> 00:28:45.796
...is there any, site-specific coastal vulnerability

497
00:28:45.856 --> 00:28:49.396
assessment that you've done to look at the site itself and its risk
of

498
00:28:49.456 --> 00:28:50.776
erosion?

499
00:28:50.876 --> 00:28:54.796
Uh, we have not conducted that particular, investigation,

500
00:28:54.836 --> 00:28:56.756
no.

501
00:29:07.316 --> 00:29:10.896
Okay. Um, m—m—moving on to the proposal to realign the

502
00:29:10.916 --> 00:29:14.476
defense position at the construction and indicative advancement

503
00:29:14.536 --> 00:29:18.436
enhancement area. I understand that you're going to remove the existing

504
00:29:18.456 --> 00:29:22.296
hard defenses and, to try and, as we discussed earlier in the

505
00:29:22.316 --> 00:29:26.156
ecology section of this hearing, introduce saltmar— saltmarsh and

506
00:29:26.216 --> 00:29:30.196
salt meadow back into that site. I note that's

507
00:29:30.256 --> 00:29:33.996
contrary to the shoreline management plan preferred policy,

508
00:29:34.036 --> 00:29:37.076
where the policy, I believe there, is hold the line.

509
00:29:37.176 --> 00:29:41.156
I just wondered if you could explain, how that

510
00:29:41.236 --> 00:29:43.376
sits with,

511
00:29:45.596 --> 00:29:47.376
bearing in mind the parties that are signed up

512
00:29:47.416 --> 00:29:50.036
to the shoreline management plan and the number of stakeholders

513
00:29:50.076 --> 00:29:53.126
involved. They will have been

514
00:29:53.216 --> 00:29:57.036
as... Albeit that I can understand the reasons for your proposal

515
00:29:57.456 --> 00:30:01.176
and the benefit it will be to the habitat, as we already

516
00:30:01.216 --> 00:30:01.916
discussed—

517
00:30:01.936 --> 00:30:02.006
Mm—hmm

518
00:30:02.006 --> 00:30:05.976
...we are looking at a policy that's contrary to

519
00:30:05.996 --> 00:30:09.116
what NRW, Natural England,

520
00:30:09.176 --> 00:30:10.376
Defra,

521
00:30:12.836 --> 00:30:16.616
DNS, all of these parties have agreed is the position for

522
00:30:16.676 --> 00:30:19.156
that site.

523
00:30:19.216 --> 00:30:21.736
Uh, Guy Walker Springett for the, applicant.

524
00:30:21.836 --> 00:30:25.156

Uh, I'm afraid I'm gonna have to, give this further consideration
and report

525
00:30:25.196 --> 00:30:27.856
back at a, a later deadline, if that's all right.

526
00:30:27.916 --> 00:30:31.604
Okay. Thank you.Thank you. Um, does anybody want to come in on that?

527
00:30:31.624 --> 00:30:33.294
No. No, I'm getting shakes of head.

528
00:30:33.644 --> 00:30:36.114
Not in the room, but does anybody online want to just come in on
that

529
00:30:36.144 --> 00:30:38.244
point?

530
00:30:39.184 --> 00:30:40.124
Okay. Thank you.

531
00:30:41.264 --> 00:30:44.844
Uh, and a fi-final point on that, regarding the coastal

532
00:30:44.884 --> 00:30:47.244
geomorphology, is

533
00:30:48.904 --> 00:30:52.844
when you remove defenses at a site that defenses have been in
position for

534
00:30:52.884 --> 00:30:54.444
a large period of time, you get a,

535
00:30:56.224 --> 00:30:59.504
coastal catch-up. You know, the, the, the rate of erosion is very
different to the

536
00:30:59.524 --> 00:31:02.404
rate of erosion normally potentially at that site.

537
00:31:02.624 --> 00:31:02.924
Mm-hmm.

538
00:31:02.964 --> 00:31:05.724
What is the risk that we will see rapid change

539
00:31:06.704 --> 00:31:07.464
at that,

540
00:31:08.624 --> 00:31:12.244
sorry, construction and indicative involvement here in site with, with this

541
00:31:12.284 --> 00:31:13.604
proposal?

542
00:31:14.924 --> 00:31:17.944
And this is in r— the direct respect to the, sorry, go walk through for the

543
00:31:17.984 --> 00:31:21.014
applicant. Um, this is respect to the salt marsh creation zone.

544
00:31:21.044 --> 00:31:22.804
You're referring to that in particular?

545
00:31:22.864 --> 00:31:23.544
Yes. Yeah.

546
00:31:23.624 --> 00:31:26.004
Okay. Okay. That's entirely fine.

547
00:31:26.104 --> 00:31:30.024
Um, the, the risk, is

548
00:31:31.584 --> 00:31:35.364
fairly minimal that there will be a rapid, change

549
00:31:35.464 --> 00:31:37.904
in the coastal geomorphology at the site.

550
00:31:37.924 --> 00:31:41.864
The actual position of the, or proposed position for the salt marsh,

551
00:31:42.024 --> 00:31:45.864
creation site is a great deal set back from the

552
00:31:45.904 --> 00:31:49.364
present edge of the current salt marsh.

553
00:31:49.434 --> 00:31:52.474
Uh, it also, faces away from

554
00:31:52.524 --> 00:31:56.154
the, incoming tide and

555
00:31:56.244 --> 00:31:59.884
wave regime, as well. Um, so there's going to

556
00:31:59.924 --> 00:32:03.224
be... It, it'll be limited, amounts of,

557
00:32:03.684 --> 00:32:04.344
effect,

558
00:32:05.464 --> 00:32:09.104
created by this creation zone. Um, additionally, it

559
00:32:09.204 --> 00:32:12.904
is, at present, at the sort of

560
00:32:12.964 --> 00:32:16.884
highest astronomical tide mark. Um, it's quite high up on

561
00:32:16.904 --> 00:32:20.304
the tidal scale, so there's not going to be a, a vast amount

562
00:32:20.424 --> 00:32:24.284
of, tidal still water, related,

563
00:32:24.624 --> 00:32:27.144

erosion there as well.

564
00:32:28.404 --> 00:32:32.294
Okay, thank you. So again, be relying on the

565
00:32:32.344 --> 00:32:33.784
wave regime for

566
00:32:34.884 --> 00:32:38.343
the cr-creation establishment of the, the salt

567
00:32:38.384 --> 00:32:42.204
marsh and the, the crooklets that we were saying going back

568
00:32:42.244 --> 00:32:46.084
into the, the area. Okay.

569
00:32:47.084 --> 00:32:47.133
All

570
00:32:47.144 --> 00:32:51.944
right.

571
00:32:55.224 --> 00:32:58.904
Okay, thank you. I think that's, everything from me on, the coastal

572
00:32:58.944 --> 00:33:00.864
geomorphology and change at the site.

573
00:33:00.904 --> 00:33:04.024
Is there any other points that anybody wanted to come in on in the room

574
00:33:04.824 --> 00:33:06.584
or online on, those

575
00:33:06.744 --> 00:33:08.824
issues?

576
00:33:10.584 --> 00:33:12.904
Not getting any hands up online. No one in the room. So that's

right.

577
00:33:13.424 --> 00:33:16.984
So I'm gonna move on to item five point three now, if that's okay,

578
00:33:17.424 --> 00:33:20.584
which relates to, the, water

579
00:33:20.684 --> 00:33:24.124
abstraction, for the proposed. And I appreciate... Sorry, Mr.

580
00:33:24.184 --> 00:33:27.514
Um, but we've already talked about this before, but I just wanted
it...

581
00:33:27.514 --> 00:33:30.324
More things are coming up in my head, and I wanted to come back and
revisit some.

582
00:33:30.344 --> 00:33:34.034
I th- I think it possibly will take item six point three and six
point four

583
00:33:34.124 --> 00:33:36.384
together, if that's okay, 'cause they're sort of intrinsically
linked.

584
00:33:36.424 --> 00:33:38.913
You're taking some water out and putting water back.

585
00:33:38.984 --> 00:33:39.174
Um,

586
00:33:40.184 --> 00:33:43.853
and I was looking really about the clarification of the anticipated
rates of

587
00:33:43.904 --> 00:33:47.644
abstraction discharge for the proposed development and how these
will interface

588
00:33:47.684 --> 00:33:49.984

with the existing development of the site.

589
00:33:50.044 --> 00:33:53.344
Thank you, firstly, 'cause your response greatly helped me there

590
00:33:53.904 --> 00:33:57.204
and, explained to me how you currently

591
00:33:58.404 --> 00:34:01.324
take water in and out of the River Dee and over what tidal cycles and also how you

592
00:34:01.364 --> 00:34:03.804
balance it and put it through the purge pump back.

593
00:34:03.864 --> 00:34:06.664
But what I wanted to make sure I understand, and please correct me if I've

594
00:34:06.704 --> 00:34:10.205
misinterpreted your response here, is you're not proposing to

595
00:34:10.245 --> 00:34:14.133
significantly increase the abstraction or discharge from the structures at the

596
00:34:14.205 --> 00:34:17.624
site with the flows that you'll kind of use

597
00:34:17.765 --> 00:34:21.044
being balanced through the cooling water and the purge

598
00:34:21.084 --> 00:34:24.844
pumps. And as your demand grows at your proposed

599
00:34:25.044 --> 00:34:26.904
development, so it will shrink

600
00:34:28.185 --> 00:34:31.524
for the discontinued use of the existing power station

601

00:34:31.984 --> 00:34:33.444
and to ensure that you've got this balance.

602
00:34:33.484 --> 00:34:35.984
So you're taking everything from the river and putting everything
back into the

603
00:34:36.024 --> 00:34:38.964
river as was. You're balancing it through your,

604
00:34:39.844 --> 00:34:41.544
cooling water and purge pumps.

605
00:34:43.144 --> 00:34:47.103
So I was interested to know if the existing water abstraction and

606
00:34:47.185 --> 00:34:51.124
discharge regime has had any noticeable effect on the Dee Estuary,

607
00:34:51.163 --> 00:34:54.324
and whether any future use should be modified to

608
00:34:54.384 --> 00:34:58.134
mitigate all that impact.

609
00:34:58.364 --> 00:35:02.014
That's the first part of that question, if that's all right.

610
00:35:02.044 --> 00:35:03.934
Roger Brander for the applicant. Um,

611
00:35:05.704 --> 00:35:08.904
notwithstanding everything you just, just said there, I suppose the,
the key thing

612
00:35:09.044 --> 00:35:12.884
to highlight is, is the, the existing Connah's Quay Power

613
00:35:12.944 --> 00:35:16.804
Station has a water abstraction license and an

614

00:35:16.844 --> 00:35:20.794
existing environmental permit that under which the kind of, you

615
00:35:20.804 --> 00:35:24.774
know, measurement monitoring of, of abstraction and discharge is,
is,

616
00:35:24.824 --> 00:35:28.804
is, is, is, regulated. And it's the, it's, you

617
00:35:28.824 --> 00:35:32.464
know, it's very much the, the intent and an advantage of the project

618
00:35:32.624 --> 00:35:36.354
that, you know, we have that in place, and we're, you know,
intending to

619
00:35:36.384 --> 00:35:40.204
continue that arrangement in what is in effect exactly the

620
00:35:40.244 --> 00:35:44.044
same way that it is, is, is, is going to be or

621
00:35:44.104 --> 00:35:47.824
rather is operated today. So from the perspective

622
00:35:47.924 --> 00:35:51.404
of, of the... And, and, you know, we're not requesting any

623
00:35:51.464 --> 00:35:55.164
changes to flows or temperatures or total

624
00:35:55.204 --> 00:35:58.204
volumes or composition or any of those sorts of

625
00:35:58.214 --> 00:36:02.014
parameters, you know, as part of, as part of this

626
00:36:02.044 --> 00:36:06.024
application. So, if you were kind of looking at this

627

00:36:06.064 --> 00:36:09.924
from the perspective of the Dee, then you wouldn't

628
00:36:10.224 --> 00:36:11.764
notice a difference at all

629
00:36:12.664 --> 00:36:16.284
'cause it, you know, we-- the same, you know, we're seeking to be able to withdraw

630
00:36:16.324 --> 00:36:19.984
the same volumes and return them as, as we have been,

631
00:36:20.584 --> 00:36:23.714
as we have been since, you know, for the, for the whole life of the existing

632
00:36:23.784 --> 00:36:26.744
power station, the existing Connah's Quay Power Station.

633
00:36:26.974 --> 00:36:30.884
I s- I suppose the one, the one caveat to that is that we

634
00:36:30.924 --> 00:36:34.664
will be replacing the eel screens, on the

635
00:36:34.884 --> 00:36:38.696
abstraction point. Um-To make them compliant with

636
00:36:38.716 --> 00:36:42.386
the, the eel regulations. I forget the year of those, but I'm sure somebody will

637
00:36:42.576 --> 00:36:45.555
correct me or draw my attention to that.

638
00:36:45.676 --> 00:36:49.116
Um, so really that is the only,

639
00:36:49.636 --> 00:36:53.416
the only kind of material, if you like, change to the abstraction

640
00:36:53.676 --> 00:36:56.796
arrangement that is, is going to be put in place.

641
00:36:56.876 --> 00:36:59.936
The, um... Well, it already is in place.

642
00:36:59.996 --> 00:37:03.896
The, the changes happen in, you know, as you highlighted

643
00:37:03.936 --> 00:37:07.536
yourself between the settlement pond and the purge pond, and how
things

644
00:37:07.576 --> 00:37:11.396
are effectively connected, you know, on our, on our

645
00:37:11.476 --> 00:37:15.456
site. So that's a, you know, a-a-an issue that's managed

646
00:37:15.516 --> 00:37:19.336
as part of the, as part of the development and, is, is, is

647
00:37:19.396 --> 00:37:22.336
described in the proposed development in chapter four.

648
00:37:22.416 --> 00:37:26.376
So I suppose to kind of cut to your point, there's not really

649
00:37:26.436 --> 00:37:28.976
much changing from the perspective of, of the D.

650
00:37:29.036 --> 00:37:31.916
So, so that in that sense there isn't a change.

651
00:37:33.056 --> 00:37:35.816
No, thank you. I've, I've... That was very helpful, that reply.

652
00:37:35.896 --> 00:37:37.916
It helped me, elaborate on that.

653

00:37:37.996 --> 00:37:42.406
Um...

654
00:37:44.776 --> 00:37:48.456
And like you say, your existing permit will control the release and
abstraction of

655
00:37:48.496 --> 00:37:52.096
that water, so that's... And if, if NRW are comfortable with that as
it currently

656
00:37:52.156 --> 00:37:52.886
stands, then

657
00:37:53.836 --> 00:37:56.406
there's no reason to think they won't be going forwards.

658
00:37:56.516 --> 00:37:59.336
Um, you've already answered my follow-up question to some extent.

659
00:37:59.356 --> 00:38:01.616
I was just thinking, you know, looking at the need to improve,
bearing in mind

660
00:38:01.656 --> 00:38:05.456
you've got existing infrastructure that's serving the existing power
station,

661
00:38:06.056 --> 00:38:09.476
w-we wanted to talk a little bit about what changes you're making to
any of

662
00:38:09.536 --> 00:38:13.496
that for the new proposal. But I

663
00:38:13.516 --> 00:38:16.576
understand that, you know, you're obviously gonna create the eel

664
00:38:16.616 --> 00:38:17.986
screens. Um,

665
00:38:18.936 --> 00:38:22.496

but those structures presumably have, have been going quite a while now, your

666
00:38:22.536 --> 00:38:25.456
intake and outtake. Uh, discharge structure, sorry.

667
00:38:25.536 --> 00:38:28.176
So is there any proposal to,

668
00:38:30.976 --> 00:38:33.516
refurbish those other than the eel screens?

669
00:38:33.536 --> 00:38:35.856
And understanding what you're gonna do with the outfall for the surface water

670
00:38:35.876 --> 00:38:38.136
outfall as well. That's, that's a separate issue, I appreciate.

671
00:38:38.176 --> 00:38:38.316
But,

672
00:38:39.356 --> 00:38:43.016
is there anything you're proposing to do to those two structures to extend their

673
00:38:43.076 --> 00:38:44.876
life? And also the

674
00:38:45.796 --> 00:38:49.576
cooling water, purge ponds, are they, are they okay to keep

675
00:38:49.596 --> 00:38:51.616
going or are you, you changing anything there?

676
00:38:52.656 --> 00:38:54.036
Roger Brandler for the applicant.

677
00:38:54.136 --> 00:38:58.116
Um, there are no wholesale, whole-wholesale changes

678

00:38:58.236 --> 00:39:00.526
proposed. Um, there will be some...

679
00:39:00.536 --> 00:39:04.176
Well, there will be inspections as there are to support the ongoing

680
00:39:04.336 --> 00:39:08.196
management and operation of the asset, and there will inevitably, I suppose, be

681
00:39:08.236 --> 00:39:11.196
some sort of, localized repairs to things.

682
00:39:11.216 --> 00:39:13.876
But there is no, there's no

683
00:39:15.076 --> 00:39:18.616
substantial replacement or, or whatever, you know, however you'd like to say that.

684
00:39:18.636 --> 00:39:22.116
There's, there's, there's nothing that's going to be particularly intrusive in any

685
00:39:22.156 --> 00:39:26.096
way in terms of, in terms of the work that's, envisaged,

686
00:39:26.876 --> 00:39:30.176
on that system. Um, within the, within the assessment

687
00:39:30.216 --> 00:39:33.696
that was performed as part of the application, we did sort of set out some

688
00:39:34.296 --> 00:39:37.516
sort of, you know, working, what's the word, method statements for how

689
00:39:37.816 --> 00:39:41.576
things, how those repairs could be undertaken and, you know, be very carefully

690

00:39:41.636 --> 00:39:45.616
controlled and it'll also be separately, regulated under a marine

691
00:39:45.656 --> 00:39:49.316
license, which we will, you know, seek to obtain for those

692
00:39:49.396 --> 00:39:53.316
works. So, you know, they are, they, they will be tightly

693
00:39:53.336 --> 00:39:56.936
controlled, in and of themselves and, and they

694
00:39:57.016 --> 00:40:00.696
are, as I'd say, it's

695
00:40:00.776 --> 00:40:02.886
relatively modest activities, if you see what I

696
00:40:02.936 --> 00:40:05.396
mean.

697
00:40:18.756 --> 00:40:22.556
Thank you. Um, I think that covers the points I wanted to raise on what

698
00:40:22.596 --> 00:40:24.876
comes in and out of the River Dee to your site.

699
00:40:24.976 --> 00:40:28.236
Um, I think that covers item five point four as well, to be honest.

700
00:40:28.246 --> 00:40:31.096
I, I just want to understand i-in my head what,

701
00:40:33.236 --> 00:40:37.076
what changes, what are the risk of changes to water that is abstracted and

702
00:40:37.096 --> 00:40:40.256
water that is discharged in a day. And I think you, again, in your written response

703
00:40:40.276 --> 00:40:43.986
to me, I appreciate that. I think it's quite clear that that is,

704
00:40:44.656 --> 00:40:47.896
not unlikely to change throughout all of the relative scenarios of

705
00:40:47.936 --> 00:40:51.666
plant one or... Sorry, train one or train two or, or concurrently train one and

706
00:40:51.716 --> 00:40:55.376
train two being constructed. So, thank you.

707
00:40:55.456 --> 00:40:55.636
Um,

708
00:40:57.056 --> 00:41:01.026
I don't have any more items on that to address for water and

709
00:41:01.056 --> 00:41:04.936
abstraction. Does anybody in the room want to come in on any of those points?

710
00:41:05.796 --> 00:41:08.776
And does anybody online want to comment on anything that's just been

711
00:41:08.796 --> 00:41:12.196
s-mentioned?

712
00:41:14.396 --> 00:41:18.336
Okay, thank you. Um, I'm gonna move on to item six now just to review

713
00:41:18.676 --> 00:41:21.916
the issues we've discussed. Thank you again for all your support and the

714
00:41:21.936 --> 00:41:22.766
information that you've provided.

715
00:41:22.776 --> 00:41:25.976

It's been very helpful to help me conduct this examination.

716
00:41:26.076 --> 00:41:29.156
Um, I've noticed that we've... a couple of things, a couple of
points throughout

717
00:41:29.236 --> 00:41:32.116
the, conversation. I've asked for things to be followed up in
writing.

718
00:41:32.176 --> 00:41:36.116
Um, again, apologies on my part about the submissions that you were
gonna

719
00:41:36.136 --> 00:41:39.276
bring to this hearing and the figures that, that people like, Mr.

720
00:41:39.296 --> 00:41:41.396
Walker spring it, we're gonna refer to.

721
00:41:41.456 --> 00:41:42.986
Sorry, sir, would you like to say something?

722
00:41:43.556 --> 00:41:43.606
What?

723
00:41:43.606 --> 00:41:46.776
Oh, I thought you, thought you were edging–

724
00:41:48.716 --> 00:41:51.146
Sorry.

725
00:41:56.476 --> 00:41:56.886
Sorry, sorry.

726
00:41:56.886 --> 00:41:56.886
It's okay.

727
00:41:56.886 --> 00:41:59.236
Sorry, we were just checking. But no, sir, nothing.

728

00:41:59.276 --> 00:41:59.596
Okay.

729
00:41:59.656 --> 00:41:59.766
Yes.

730
00:42:00.356 --> 00:42:04.236
Um, I think I highlighted a couple, and apologies, I

731
00:42:04.336 --> 00:42:07.196
can't remember where they are now, but it was about if you could follow up with,

732
00:42:07.496 --> 00:42:10.516
those additional submissions and the referencing to that.

733
00:42:10.596 --> 00:42:14.276
And, Dr. Riley, again, I think I asked for a comment, a,

734
00:42:15.256 --> 00:42:18.736
the list of the precedent sites as well, if that would be useful, please.

735
00:42:18.776 --> 00:42:19.356
Yes.

736
00:42:19.516 --> 00:42:20.226
Um, so

737
00:42:21.276 --> 00:42:23.106
that was...

738
00:42:25.036 --> 00:42:27.716
Are there any there that, anyone wants me to add or have I missed?

739
00:42:27.756 --> 00:42:30.616
I don't think so. I hope not. Um,

740
00:42:31.416 --> 00:42:33.106
that was... What's it? Um, no more precedent sites.

741

00:42:34.276 --> 00:42:38.216
Uh, lovely. Thank you. Um, probably an opportune time as well for me
to

742
00:42:38.256 --> 00:42:41.576
apologize to you. Uh, at the last hearing we had, you asked me to
come back to you

743
00:42:41.616 --> 00:42:44.552
on the, uh-Commentary on the consultation for the change

744
00:42:44.612 --> 00:42:47.712
notification. I did say at the hearing, yeah, more than happy with
what you

745
00:42:47.752 --> 00:42:50.972
proposed. I didn't follow up in writing, so sincere apologies on my
part.

746
00:42:51.012 --> 00:42:54.312
I think I, I, I only found that one out the other day when get-
preparing for

747
00:42:54.332 --> 00:42:58.052
this. I thought, "Oop, I didn't see that one to come." But I notice
you've done the

748
00:42:58.112 --> 00:43:00.412
change consultation and the change request is now coming.

749
00:43:00.432 --> 00:43:03.232
So again, apologies from me for not getting back to you informally
on that.

750
00:43:03.252 --> 00:43:06.372
But, hopefully I'll get back to you formally on the change request
shortly.

751
00:43:08.552 --> 00:43:08.742
Um,

752
00:43:10.012 --> 00:43:13.762
is there any other business that anyone wants to raise or matters

relating to

753
00:43:13.832 --> 00:43:16.752
this particular issue-specific hearing,

754
00:43:17.292 --> 00:43:21.262
today? None in the room. Any

755
00:43:21.292 --> 00:43:22.552
online?

756
00:43:24.132 --> 00:43:27.012
None online. Okay. Right. Well, thank you.

757
00:43:27.052 --> 00:43:29.082
I'm gonna move on to close the hearing then. Um, thank you.

758
00:43:29.092 --> 00:43:31.552
That concludes the business of this third issue-specific hearing.

759
00:43:31.572 --> 00:43:35.492
Thank you again for joining us today and providing me and others
with your advice

760
00:43:35.512 --> 00:43:38.032
and details. It's been very, very helpful, so thank you very much
for the time

761
00:43:38.052 --> 00:43:41.562
you've taken to do that. Uh, thank you again to all parties that
turned up and

762
00:43:41.592 --> 00:43:45.192
engaging in this hearing and helping me to better understand the
proposals that the

763
00:43:45.232 --> 00:43:47.612
applicant submitted and the issues that surround them.

764
00:43:47.651 --> 00:43:51.002
I do appreciate the time you've taken to come today, so thank you
for that, and

765
00:43:51.032 --> 00:43:54.252
value your input. So cl-thank you for coming along and attending.

766
00:43:54.272 --> 00:43:56.692
I'm gonna close this hearing now and look forward to hearing from
those of you who

767
00:43:56.892 --> 00:43:59.972
may be joining us either this evening at the open floor hearing.

768
00:44:00.092 --> 00:44:03.832
Uh, I'm only expecting interested parties and if I'm honest, I don't
know that we

769
00:44:03.912 --> 00:44:07.842
have many registrations, so feel free if, certainly if you're a, a,

770
00:44:08.032 --> 00:44:10.932
an organization that you don't need to attend that hearing unless
you wish to.

771
00:44:11.692 --> 00:44:15.552
Um, that hearing commences at sixteen hundred hours, and

772
00:44:15.812 --> 00:44:19.552
but then I might see some of you tomorrow also at the fourth issue
s-specific

773
00:44:19.612 --> 00:44:23.322
hearing, which, commences at ten o'clock tomorrow

774
00:44:23.332 --> 00:44:26.822
morning. This hearing is now closed at twelve fifty-nine.

775
00:44:26.852 --> 00:44:28.582
Wow, how about that? Uh, the all...

776
00:44:28.592 --> 00:44:29.032
And thank you very

777

00:44:29.052 --> 00:44:45.012
much.